

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04009 01 OF 02 301822Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ACDE-00 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00

DODE-00 NSC-05 ERDE-00 NRC-05 EB-07 /100 W

----- 004871

P R 301705Z JUL 75

FM USMISSIN NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2952

SECDEF WAHSDC PRIORITY

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4009

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED

AIR:GROUND COMMON CEILING

REFS: A. USNATO 3874 DTG 231625Z JUL 75

B. USNATO 3781 DTG 161551Z JUL 75

C. USNATO 6794 DTG 051730Z DEC 74

D. STATE 263866, NOV 75

E. USNATO 3918 DTG 251213Z JUL 75

SUMMARY: MBFR WORKING GROUP AT ITSKULY 29 SESSION CONSIDERED THE REVISED DRAFT OF THE WG REPORT ON SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING(REF A). THE DEBATE LARGELY FOLLOWED THE LINES OF THE EARLIER JULY 15 SESSION (REF B) WITH THE UK AND CANADIAN REPS LEANING TOWARD THE NEED TO RETAIN FLEXIBILITY AND THE FRG REP LEANING TOWARD MORE RIGID SUB-CEILINGS TO SAFEGUARD AGAINST POSSIBLE EASTERN CIRCUMVENTION OF THE FOCUS ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWERREDUCTIONS.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04009 01 OF 02 301822Z

THE MBFR STAFF GROUP WILL PRODUCE A NEW DRAFT LATER THIS WEEK (WE WILL TRANSMIT IT AS SOON AS IT IS CIRCULATED) WHICH THE WG WILL CONSIDER AT ITS NEXT SESSION ON AUGUST 12. END SUMMARY

1. DURING CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFTMBFR WG REPORT ON
SUB-CEILINGS WITIN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING
AT THE JULY 29 WG MEETING, THE UK MOD REP (GERAHTY) TABLED
THE FOLLOWING UK COMMENTS ON THE REVISED DRAFT (REF A):

BEGIN TEXT

SUBJ-CEILINGS WITINA COMBINED AIR/BROUND COMMON CELING
UK COMMENTS ON SITCEN 2202 OF 22 JULY 1975

GENRAL COMMENTS

1. THE AUTHOR IS TO BE CONGRATULATED ON PRODUCING A THOUGHT
PROVOKING FIRST DRAFTON A COMPLEX ISSUE IN SO SHORT A TIME.

2. THE CONTENTS OF THE COVERING PAPER, HOWEVER, EMPHASISE THAT
THE DRAFT DOES NOT ANSWER THE 64,000 DOLLAR QUESTION-WHAT (IF
ANY) IS THE SORT OF LEVEL OF FLEXIBILITY TO MIS MANPOWER BETWEEN
THE FORCES IN THE FUTURE WHICH NATO WANTS FOR ITSELF AND CAN
AFFORD TO ALLOW THE OTHER SIDE TO HAVE? IT SEEMS TO US THAT
THE WORKING GROUP MUST ANSWER THIS QUESTION BEFORE ITS ATTEMPTS
TO EXAMINE THE POSSIBLE METHODS WHICH CAN BE USED TO PERMIT
THE SORT OF LEVEL OF FLEXIBILITYTHAT IS REQUIRED. THE PAPER
SHOULD, THEREFORE, INOUR VIEW START WITH A REFERENCE TO PARAAS
43 TO 45 OF AC/276-D(95)5, ANALYZE THE EFFECTS WHICH A FLEXIBILITY
OF 20,000 MEN WOULD CONFER ON NATO(EG, ON A PRO ROTA BASIS, THE
FRG SHARE WOULD BE ABOUT 10,000 MEN AND THE UK ABOUT 2,000, IS
THIS THE SORT OF FLEXIBILITY NATIONS NEED?) AND ON THE WP (EG,
20,0000 MEN IS THE MANPOWER APPROXIMATELY EQUIVALENT TO A SOVIET
MOTOR RIFLE DIVISIONAL SLICE, OR 10,000 MEN IS THE MANPOWER
EQUIVALENT TO A SOVIET TANK DIVISION).

3. THE DRAFT ALSO DOES NOT MENTION THE ANOMALIES ISSUE, YET
THIS FACTOR COULD INFLUENCE WHICH TYPE OF SUB-CEILING, IF ANY,
NATO GOES FOR. WE SUGGEST THIS SUBJECT SHOULD BE DISCUSSED
NEXT, BEFORE THE TYPES OF SUB-CILINGS ARE EXAMINED.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04009 01 OF 02 301822Z

4. IT IS ALSO RELEVANT TO POINTOUT THAT AC/276-D(74)14 WAS
WRITTEN IN A DIFFERENTNATO "CLIMATE" THAN EXISTS TODAY.
OPTION III WAS NOT THEN IN THE IMMEDIATE OFFING AND NATO
WAS MUCH MORE FGID IN ITS REQUIREMETS, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR
INFLEXIBLE CONSTRAINTS AND THE NEED FOR MOBILE INSPECTION TEAMS
TODAY NATO APPEARS TO PUT GREATER EMPHASIS ON ITS OWN FLEXIBILTY
AND IT IS DOUBTFUL WHETHER , IF IT HAD TO WRITE AC/276-D(74)14
FOR THE FIRST TIME, THE WORKING GROUP WULD HAVE AGREED SUCH
DOGMATIC AND UNQUALIFIED STATMEMENTS AS "APPROACHES 2 AND 3
ARE, WHOLLY COMPATIBLE WITH THE ALLIED FORCES.....AND HAVE
NO ADVERSE MILITARY SECURITY EFFECTS FOR NATO". ONE COULD
ARGUE, IN THE PRESENT CLIMATE,THAT BOTH APPROACHES DO NOT
PROVIDE ANY FREEDOM TO MIX FROM AIR TO GROUND AND, THEREFOERE, THAT

THIS COULD BE REGARDED AS AN ADVERSE EFFECT. IT SEEMS TO US, THEREFORE, THAT WE SHOULD BE CAREFUL HOW WE REFER TO THE FINDINGS OF AC/276-D(74)14. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN IT WAS WRITTEN, WE HAD NOT HAD THE ADVANTAGE OF SEEING THE US PAPER OF 2 DEC 74 WHICH SHOWS THAT IT IS POSSIBLE, WITH SUITABLE QUALIFICATIONS, TO HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY AND YET STILL HAVE SUB-CEILINGS ON AIR AND GROUND FORCES (PARA 2 B OF THE ANNEX REFERS).

5. THE INTRODUCTORY SECTIONS OF THE PAPER SHOULD ALSO MENTION THE PROBLEMS OF VERIFICATION (THE LAST SENTENCE OF PARA 17 OF AC/276-D(74)14 BECOMES EVEN MORE IMPORTANT IF THERE ARE TO BE NO MOBILE INSPECTION TEAMS) AND OF CIRCUMVENTION. IF THE WP (OR NATO FOR THAT MATTER) WISH TO BET ROUND AN AGREEMENT WHICH HAS PUT CEILINGS ON AIR, GROUND OR COMBINED SERVICES, THEY WILL HAVE THE OPTION TO PRODUCE "MARINES", "IRREGULARS" OR SOME OTHER "THIRD" FORCE INTO THE AREA UNLESS SOME NON-CIRCUMVENTION ARRANGEMENT IS SET UP. THIS LEADS ON TO REMINDING OURSELVES THAT IN THE FINDING IN PARA 148B OF AC/276-D(74)14 WE (THE WG) DID AGREE TO SEE WHETHER, AND IF SO HOW, NON-CIRCUMVENTION MEASURES COULD BE ALLIED TO APPROACHES 1 TO 4.

6. TO SUMMARIZE, THEREFORE, WE THINK THE PAPER SHOULD BE RESTRUCTURED IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER:

A. AIM. AMENDED TO INCLUDE MENTION OF THE NON-CIRCUMVENTION ARRANGEMENT" REQUIREMENTS.

B. FACTORS FOR DISCUSSION

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04009 01 OF 02 301822Z

(1) THE ALIED NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(2) THE LEVEL (IF ANY) OF FLEXIBILITY REQ'D.

(3) REDEFINITION OF FORCES.

(4) VERIFICATION.

(5) NON-CIRCUMVENTIONM

C. POSSIBLE CEILING ARRANGEMENTS

(1) NON NUMERIC SUB-CEILINGS WITH BUILT-IN FLEXIBILITY ALLOWANCE

(2) OVER-LAPPING SUB-CEILINGS.

(3) SINGLE SUB-CEILING ON GROUND WITH LIMITED FLEXIBILITY FOR CHANGE

(4) NO SUB-CEILINGS AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION ARRANGEMENTS.

7. IN WRITING THIS DRAFT, WE DO NOT BELIEVE WE SHOULD BE TOO TIED BY WHAT WAS SAID IN AC/276/D(74)14 IN A DIFFERENT NATO ATMOSOPHSER.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04009 02 OF 02 301928Z

65
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00

DODE-00 NSC-05 ERDE-00 NRC-05 EB-07 /100 W

----- 005749

P R 301705Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2953
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4009

2. THE CANADIAN REP BECKETT AGREED WITH THE THRUST OF THE UK COMMENTS THAT THE PRIMARY ISSUE TO BE DETERMINED IS WHETHER NATO SHOULD TILT TOWARD RIGID SAFEGUARDS OR FLEXIBILITY IN ESTABLISHING SUB-CEILINGS. HE INTERPRETED THE WG DRAFT AS LEANING TOWARD RIGIDITY, POINTING ESPECIALLY TO PARA 19 OF THE ANNEX TO THE DRAFT. WHILE HE DID NOT YET HAVE PRECISE INSTRUCTIONS, HE BELIEVED OTTAWA WOULD FAVOR FLEXIBILITY OVER FIGIDITY.

3. THE WG CHAIRMAN (SMITH) SAID THE DRAFT WAS NOT INTENTIONALLY TILTED TOWARD RIGIDITY. HE SAID THE KEY POINT WOULD BE DEFINING THE "APPROXIMATE PARITY" CONCEPT EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARA 19; IN THE ABSENCE OF A CHANGE IN THE BASIC NATO MANDATE, THE WG MUST RETAIN ITS FOCUS ON GROUND FORCES.

4. SPEAKING PERSONALLY THE FRG REP (HOYNCK) AGREED THAT THE FOCUS ON GROUNDFORCES MUST BE RETAINED. HE SAID ONE FACTOR MISSING FROM THE DRAFT IS THE TIME FACTOR; I.E., HE PRESUMED

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04009 02 OF 02 301928Z

THERE WOULD BE SOME SORT OF REVIEW CLAUSE IN A PHASE II AGREEMENT THAT WOULD ALLOW RECONSIDERATION OF SUB-CEILINGS (AMONG OTHER FACTORS) AFTER A SPEDIVIC PERIOD OF TIME. POSSIBLY SUB-CEILINGS COULD CONTAIN RIGID SAFEGUARDS INITIALLY, BUT SUBSEQUENTLY HE MADE MORE FLEXIBLE SHOULD TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES MAKE FORCE RESTRUCTURING DESIRABLE. HE BELIEVED THAT ANY SHORT-TERM FLEXIBILITY REQUIREMENT WOLD BE BETTER SERVED BY A DEGREE OF FREEDOM TO RESTUCUTRE FORCES FROM GROUND TO AIR.

5. THE UK FCO REP (ABRAHAM) DISAGREED WITH HEH FRG REP, FORESEEING A NEED TO RESTRUCTURE FORCES FROM AIR- TO GROUND AS MORE LIKELY. WITH REGARD TO THE TIME FACTOR, HE CALLED FOR MORE PRECISION IN SUCH TERMS AS S"SHORT TERM," "LING-TERM", PERHAPS FIVE OR TEN YEARS FOR "SHORT" TERM." THE UK MOD REP SAID THAT THE DPQ'S COVER FIVE YEARS, MAKING IT EASY TO PROJECT REQUIREMENTS THAT FAR. HOWEVER, HE BELIEVES IT IS IMPORTANT TO PROJECT RESTRUCTUREING REQUIREMENTS BEYOND TIS FIVE YEAR PERIOD.

6. THE FRG REP SAID THAT IF A FIVE YEAR LIMIT WERE ADOPTED AS A REVIEW CLAUSE ON SUB-CEILINGS, THEN NATO COLD REQUEST RELATIVELY RIGID SAFEGUARDS SINCE ALLIED REQUIREMENTS COULD BE PROJECTED THAT FAR. HE DID NOT SEE A NEED TO WORRY ABOUT PROBLEMS BEYOND THAT TIME RANGE; ANY TECHNOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGHS THAT MIGHT CREATE PRESSURES ON THE WEST TO RESTUUCTURE FORCES WOULD CREATE SIMILAR PRESSURES ON THE EAST.

7. THE UK MOD REP QUESTIONED THIS FRG PREMISE, AGRUCING THAT NATO IS WEAKEST ON THE GROUND AND WILL FEEL GREATER PRESSURES TO STRENGTHEN GROUND FORCES THAN WILL THE EAST . THE FRG REP COUNTERED, HOWEVER, THAT THE GOAL OF A PHASE II AGREEMENT IS TO REMOVE ANY SUCH WEAKNESS OF ESTABLISHING "APPROXIMATE PARITY" BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES. IN ANY EVENT, HE BELIEVED THE "COLLECTIVE" CHARACTER OF THE COMMONCEILING ON THE WEST WOULD PROVIDE SUFFICIENT ROOM FOR FLEXIBILITY IN RESTRUCTURING NATO FORCES SHOULD THIS BECOME NECESSARY.

8. THE UK MOD REP SAID THE UK POSTION DOES NOT ADVOCATE FLEXIBILITY PER SE, ONLY THAT THE FLEXIBILITY ISSUE NEEDS MORE STUDY THAN IT HAS RECEIVED IN THE WG DRAFTS THUS FAR. HE BELIEVED THIS STEMMED FROM#TO GREAT A RELIANCE ON THE ORIGINAL
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04009 02 OF 02 301928Z

WG SUTDY IN AC/276-WP(74)14(REF C) WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE US PROPOSALS OF LAST DECEMBER (REF D). HE SAID THE CURRENT WG DRAFT (REF A) IS ALSO DEFICIENT IN NOT CONSIDERING THE PROBLEMS OF FORCE REDEFINITIONS (REF E) IN RELATION TO SUB-CEILINGS.

9. THE FRG REP AGREED THAT THE FORCE REDEFINITION ISSUE AND SUB-CEILINGS ARERELATED AND THAT BOTH SHOULD BE STUDIED TOGETHER.

WITH REGARD TO THE US PROPOSALS OF LAST SEPTEMBER, THE FRG REP FELT THEY WERE TOO IMPRECISE. HE BELIEVES THAT EITHER OF THE TWO EXTREMES OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS--EITHER NO FIXED CEILINGS OR FIGIDLY DEFINED CEILINGS--COULD BE ENFORCED MORE EASILY. COMPROMISE SOLUTIONS OF A "LIMITED FREEDOM TO MIX" NATURE SUCH AS THE US PROPOSAL OF NON-EXPLLCIT SUB-CEILINGS WOULD PROVIDE THE SOVIETS WITH A DROIT DE REGARD TO QUESTION EVEN MINOR FORCE CHANGES BY THE ALLIES.

10. RATHER THAN CONSIDERING DETAILED CHANGES IN THE REVISED WG DRAFT REPORT, THE WG CHAIRMAN SUGGESTED THE MBFR STAFF GROUP PREPARE A NEW DERAFT CONTAINING THE POINTS SURFACED DURING THE DISCUSSION FOR CIRCULATION AT THE END OF THIS WEEK (WE WILL TRANSMIT WHEN RECEIVED). THE UK MOD REP URGED THAT THE WG REPS SEND THIS REPORT TO CAPITALS IN ORDER TO HAVE A MEANINGFUL INSTRUCTED EXCHANGE AT THE NEXT WG SESSION ON AUGUST 12; HE SAID EARLY, SIMULTANEOUS INTROUCTION OF OPTION III AND AN AIR GROUND COMMONEILING WILL DEPEND UPON THIS SUB-CEILINGS STUDY BY THE WG. THE FRG REP AGREED WITH THE UK ON THIS POINT

11. COMMENT: THE BASIC DIFFERENCE OF VIEW BETWEEN THE FRG AND THE UK,I.E., RIGID SAFEGUARDS V. FLEXIBILITY, NOTED IN THE JULY 15 WG MEETING STILLPREVAILS; HOWEVER, THE GERMAN ATTITUDE APPEARS TO BE SOMEWHAT TOUGHER THAN THAT OF THE UK. BOTH ARE AGREED ON THE NEED TO PROCEED WITH THE SUB-CEILINGS STUDYAS EXPIDITIIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE AND BOTH FEEL THAT THE FORCE REDEFINITION ISSUE WILL ALSO AFFECT THE SUB-CEILINGS ISSUE(THE CANADIAN REP ALSO CONCURS IN THIS LATTER POIJT). END COMMENT

12. ACTION REQUESTED: REQUEST GUIDANCE ON SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING PRIORTYTO THE SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04009 02 OF 02 301928Z

AUGUST 12 WG SESSION.
BRUCE

OMISSION CORRECTION TO FOLLOW.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: izenbei0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO04009
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USMISSIN NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrlgt.tel
Line Count: 314
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 3874 DTG 231625Z JUL 75 B. USNATO 3781 DTG 161551Z JUL 75 C. USNATO 6794 DTG 051730Z DEC 74 D.
STATE 263866, NOV 75 E. USNATO 3918 DTG 251213Z JUL 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: izenbei0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 04 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <04 APR 2003 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <24 SEP 2003 by izenbei0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED AIR:GROUND COMMON CEILING
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF WAHSDC INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006